BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
DEC 23 1985
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

Nos. 85-429, 85-430, 85-432, 85-440 and 85-444

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1985

EXXON CORPORATION, *et al.*,
Petitioners,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,
Respondents.

On Petitions for a Writ of Certiorari to the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals of the United States

---

BRIEF FOR THE STATE RESPONDENTS IN OPPOSITION

FRANCIS X. BELLOTTI
Attorney General
of Massachusetts
GEORGE B. DEAN
ALAN L. KOVACS
One Ashburton Place—
20th Floor
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

DAVID FROHNMAYER
Attorney General of Oregon
DONALD C. ARNOLD
100 State Office Building
Salem, Oregon 43710

JOHN VAN DE KAMP
Attorney General of California
YEORYIOS C. APALLAS
6000 State Building
350 McAllister
San Francisco, California 94102

ANDREW P. MILLER
GEORGE KAUFMANN
STEPHAN G. WIELGOZ
DICKSTEIN, SHAPIRO & MORIN
2101 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 785-9700

BERNARD NASH
EDWARD G. MODELL
BLUM, NASH & RAILSBACK
1133 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 857-0220

JAMES F. FLUG
PAULA DINERSTEIN
LOBEL, NOVINS & LAMONT
1275 K Street, N.W.
Suite 770
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 371-6626

December 23, 1985

WILSON - EPES PRINTING CO., INC. - 789-0096 - WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Did the District Court abuse its discretion under § 209 of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, in formulating a remedy for overcharges modeled on previous restitutionary legislation, where the spreading of the consequences of the violation to consumers throughout the economy made it impossible to determine the injuries of individual victims?

2. Do any of the petitioners raise a substantial question that the District Court erroneously denied them any procedural right?

LIST OF JURISDICTIONS JOINING IN THIS BRIEF

We accept the listing of parties below as set forth in the respective petitions; however, we here specifically list the jurisdictions which join in this brief.

Alabama
Arkansas
California
Colorado
Connecticut
Delaware
District of Columbia
Georgia
Guam
Hawaii
Idaho
Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Kansas
Louisiana
Maine
Maryland
Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
Mississippi
Montana
Nebraska
Nevada
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New Mexico
New York
North Carolina
North Dakota
Ohio
Oregon
Pennsylvania
Puerto Rico
Rhode Island
South Carolina
South Dakota [1]
Tennessee
Texas
Utah
Vermont
Virgin Islands
Virginia
West Virginia
Wisconsin
Wyoming

---

[1] South Dakota joins in the brief as *amicus curiae* pursuant to Rule 36.4 of this Court.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	i
LIST OF JURISDICTIONS JOINING IN THIS BRIEF	ii
COUNTERSTATEMENT OF THE CASE	1
A. The Regulatory Program	3
B. The Proceedings Below	5
1. The District Court	5
2. The Court of Appeals	9
REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITIONS	12
I. TECA'S AFFIRMANCE OF THE DISTRICT COURT'S EXERCISE OF ITS EQUITABLE DISCRETION RAISES NO ISSUE WARRANTING FURTHER REVIEW BY THIS COURT	14
A. Because Section 209 of the ESA Vested the District Court with Broad Equitable Powers, the Scope of "Appellate Review is Correspondingly Narrow"	14
B. The Remedy Chosen by the District Court Was Well-Grounded in Fact and Law	15
1. The Record and Regulatory Scheme Made It Clear That It Was Impossible to Trace the Impact of Exxon's Overcharges to Individual Victims	15
2. The Restitutionary Remedy Selected by the District Court Was Equitable, Fair and Reasonable	18
3. TECA's Decision Is Entirely Consistent With This Court's Decisions	22
II. NONE OF THE PETITIONS PRESENTS A PROCEDURAL ISSUE WARRANTING REVIEW	25
CONCLUSION	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES: Page

Adams Resources and Energy, Inc., 9 DOE ¶ 82,553 (1982) 19
Alfred B. Alkek, 9 DOE ¶ 82,521 (1982) 19
Cities Service Co. v. *FEA*, 529 F.2d 1016 (Em. App. 1975), *cert. denied*, 426 U.S. 947 (1976) 5, 7
Citronelle-Mobile Gathering, Inc. v. *Edwards*, 669 F.2d 717 (Em. App.), *cert. denied*, 459 U.S. 877 (1982) 14, 22, 25
Department of Energy Stripper Well Exemption Litigation, M.D.L. No. 378 (D. Kan.) 16
Federal Power Commission v. *Interstate Natural Gas Co.*, 336 U.S. 577 (1949) 24
Hanover Shoe, Inc. v. *United Shoe Machinery Corp.*, 392 U.S. 481 (1968) 27
Hecht Co. v. *Bowles*, 321 U.S. 321 (1944) 20
Hodgson v. *United Mine Workers*, 153 U.S. App. D.C. 407, 473 F.2d 118 (1972) 29
Illinois Brick Co. v. *Illinois*, 431 U.S. 720 (1977) ... 27
Lemon v. *Kurtzman*, 411 U.S. 192 (1973) 15
Mitchell v. *DeMario Jewelry, Inc.*, 361 U.S. 288 (1960) 14, 15, 20
NAACP v. *New York*, 413 U.S. 345 (1973) 29
Pellegrino v. *Nesbit*, 203 F.2d 463 (9th Cir. 1953) .. 29
Porter v. *Warner Holding Co.*, 328 U.S. 395 (1946) 14, 15, 20, 22-23
Sauder v. *DOE*, 648 F.2d 1341 (Em. App. 1981) 14, 22
Smuck v. *Hobson*, 132 U.S. App. D.C. 372, 408 F.2d 175 (1969) 29
Textile Workers v. *Lincoln Mills*, 353 U.S. 448 (1957) 22
Tully v. *Mobil Oil Corp.*, 455 U.S. 245 (1982) 12
Tumey v. *Ohio*, 273 U.S. 510 (1927) 18
Union Oil Co. v. *DOE*, 688 F.2d 797 (Em. App. 1982), *cert. denied*, 459 U.S. 1202 (1983) 5, 7
United Airlines, Inc. v. *McDonald*, 432 U.S. 385 (1977) 29
United States v. *Leib*, 333 F. Supp. 424 (W.D. Tex. 1971), *aff'd*, 462 F.2d 1161 (Em. App. 1972) 22
Wolpe v. *Poretsky*, 70 U.S. App. D.C. 141, 144 F.2d 505, *cert. denied*, 323 U.S. 777 (1944) 29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION	Page
Fifth Amendment	25
STATUTES	
Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, 12 U.S.C. § 1904 note	
§ 209	1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 14
§ 210	11
§ 211	2
Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 751 *et seq.*	3, 4
15 U.S.C. § 753(b) (2)	3
15 U.S.C. § 753(b) (2) (A)	4
15 U.S.C. § 754(a) (1)	2
Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, ch. 26, 56 Stat. 23 (repealed 1946)	
§ 205(a)	14, 22
§ 205(e)	22
Energy Conservation and Existing Buildings Act of 1976, Part A, 42 U.S.C. § 6861 *et seq.*	20
Energy Policy and Conservation Act, Part D of Title III, 42 U.S.C. § 6321 *et seq.*	20
§ 6322(a) (1)	21
§ 6322(c)	21
§ 6322(d) (5)	21
Energy Policy and Conservation Act, Part G of Title III, U.S.C. 42 U.S.C. § 6371 *et seq.*	20
Further Continuing Appropriations Act 1983, Pub. L. No. 97-377, 96 Stat. 1830, 1919 § 155 (1982)	8, 9, 18-22
Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981, 42 U.S.C. § 8621 *et seq.*	21
National Energy Extension Service Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7001 *et seq.*	20
§ 7004(b) (6)	21
§ 7004(b) (7)	21
§ 7005(h)	21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

COURT RULES Page

Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States

Rule 17 12
Rule 36.4 ii

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

Rule 24 25
Rule 24(a) 28, 29
Rule 24(b) 29
Rule 56 ..... 25, 28

REGULATIONS AND PROPOSED REGULATIONS

Executive Order No. 12287, 46 Fed. Reg. 9909..... 4

Mandatory Petroleum Allocation and Price Regulations, 10 C.F.R. §~~211~~ *et seq.* (1984)

§ 211.67 ..... 4, 5, 7, 9, 10
Part 212, Subparts F and L 7
§ 212.83(c) 10
§ 212.83(c)(2)(iii) 7
§ 212.83(d) 10
§ 212.93(a) 10
Energy Measures and Energy Audits, 10 C.F.R. Part 450 (1985) 21

Mandatory Petroleum Products Allocation and Procedural Regulations, 39 Fed. Reg. 1924 (1974) 4

Allocation of Old Oil, 39 Fed. Reg. 31650 (1974), *reprinted in* Energy Mgmt. (CCH), Proposed Regulations 1974-1978, ¶ 12,526 4

LEGISLATIVE MATERIALS

128 Cong. Rec. S15115 (daily ed. Dec. 16, 1982).... 19
128 Cong. Rec. S15116 (daily ed. Dec. 16, 1982).... 18
128 Cong. Rec. S15117 (daily ed. Dec. 16, 1982).... 20
128 Cong. Rec. S15701 (daily ed. Dec. 20, 1982).... 19

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1985

Nos. 85-429, 85-430, 85-432, 85-440 and 85-444

EXXON CORPORATION, *et al.*,
Petitioners,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,
Respondents.

On Petitions for a Writ of Certiorari to the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals of the United States

---

BRIEF FOR THE STATE RESPONDENTS IN OPPOSITION [1]

COUNTERSTATEMENT OF THE CASE

This is an action brought by the United States under § 209 of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 ("ESA"),

---

[1] This brief is filed on behalf of the States and other jurisdictions listed on p. ii, *supra*. Although we maintain that the courts below correctly resolved all questions of liability (including amount) in favor of the United States and against the Exxon Corporation ("Exxon"), because of the limited scope of the intervention which we were granted below, this brief does not respond to Exxon's petition for certiorari (No. 85-429), which presents no question concerning the distribution of the amounts for which Exxon was held liable.

The opinions below will be cited to the Appendix to the Exxon petition ("Exx. App.").

as amended,[2] against Exxon Corporation, alleging that the prices Exxon charged beginning in January 1975 for crude oil produced from the Hawkins Field Unit ("HFU") in Texas exceeded the maximum prices permitted by law. The District Court found in favor of the United States on the issue of liability. In fashioning an equitable remedy under § 209, the District Court accepted the Government's contention that, "[d]ue to the pervasive reach of oil price regulation at the time these overcharges occurred, . . . the overcharges worked their way throughout the economy nationwide to the *millions of ultimate consumers of petroleum products*," [3] and ordered Exxon "to make restitution of the full amount of the overcharges, plus interest, to the [United States] Treasury" [4], to be held in trust for immediate redistribution to the States [5] in proportion to each State's share of nationwide consumption of petroleum products, for expenditures on energy-related programs designed to benefit their injured citizens.[6] TECA, which has exclusive appellate jurisdiction in all ESA and EPAA matters (see ESA § 211), affirmed the District Court's Order.

Four petitions for certiorari, in addition to that of Exxon, have been filed by intervenor-parties at virtually every level of distribution and use of petroleum products,

---

[2] 12 U.S.C. § 1904 note, as incorporated by § 5(c)(1) of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 ("EPAA"), as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 754(a)(1). In relevant part, § 209 of the ESA provides that a court may "order restitution of moneys received in violation of any . . . order or regulation [under this Title]."

[3] Exx. App. 239a (emphasis added).

[4] Exx. App. 254a.

[5] As used herein, the term "States" refers to all fifty States, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

[6] Exx. App. 255a-256a.

from refiners to an individual motorist.[7] All challenge the District Court's restitutionary order and contend that awards should instead have been made to them (and to the classes which some purport to represent).

A. The Regulatory Program

The District Court's Order and TECA's affirmance rest squarely on the regulatory program which these decisions implement: we therefore begin by describing that program.

The EPAA, 15 U.S.C. § 751 *et seq.*, directed the President to promulgate regulations implementing price and allocation controls on petroleum and petroleum products, and further directed, in relevant part, that:

> [i]n specifying prices (or prescribing the manner for determining them), the regulation shall provide for (A) a dollar-for-dollar passthrough of net increases in the cost of crude oil, residual fuel oil, and refined petroleum products to all marketers or distributors at the retail level . . . [EPAA, § 4(b)(2), 15 U.S.C. § 753(b)(2)]

"Passthrough" is the key word in this passage and the cornerstone of the implementing regulations. From their

---

[7] The four petitions were filed by: Marathon Petroleum Company, Mobil Oil Corporation, Murphy Oil Corporation, Ashland Oil, Inc., Pennzoil Company, Tenneco Oil Company, and Tosco Corporation (collectively "Marathon") (No. 85-430); Air Transport Association of America, Petroleum Marketers Association of America, The Jobbers' Group, and Independent Gasoline Retailers (collectively "ATA") (No. 85-432); Philadelphia Electric Company ("PECO") (No. 84-440); and National Freight Inc., RJG Cab Co. Inc., and Geraldine H. Sweeney (collectively "National Freight") (No. 85-444). These petitions and their appendices are referred to hereafter, respectively, as, "Mar. Pet." and "Mar. App.", "ATA Pet." and "ATA App.", "PECO Pet." and "PECO App.", and "Nat. Frt. Pet." and "Nat. Frt. App." The 45-volume Record of proceedings in the District Court as filed in the TECA will be referred to by volume number and page number as "— R. —."

adoption on January 14, 1974,[8] until all petroleum products were decontrolled on January 28, 1981,[9] the regulations promulgated pursuant to the EPAA permitted refiners, crude oil resellers and petroleum product resellers to pass through to their customers their net increases in crude oil costs for refined petroleum products, together with their increased costs of purchased refined products and certain "non-product" costs.[10] On August 30, 1974, the Department of Energy's ("DOE") predecessor agency, the Federal Energy Administration ("FEA"), published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking concerning the Old Oil Allocation ("Entitlements") Program.[11] FEA stated that "[t]he objective of the entitlements program proposed is to achieve the equitable distribution of the low priced old oil among all sectors of the petroleum industry . . . ." (39 *Fed. Reg.* at 31650). FEA also commented that "[u]nder the proposal, all money spent or received as the result of the purchase or sale of entitlements would be passed through to consumers, either as a cost increase or decrease, respectively." (*Id.*).

Effective November 29, 1974, FEA adopted regulations instituting the Entitlements Program.[12] In keeping with the Congressional mandate that there be "dollar-for-dollar passthrough of the net increases in the cost of crude oil," 15 U.S.C. § 753(b)(2)(A), the regulations provided that the entitlements costs or proceeds would be included in crude oil cost calculations. In upholding the constitutionality and validity of the Entitlements Program, TECA explained:

> The basic purpose of the Entitlements Program was to spread the benefit of access to old price-con rolled

---

[8] *See* 39 *Fed. Reg.* 1924 (1974).

[9] *See* Exec. Order No. 12287; 46 *Fed. Reg.* 9909 (1981).

[10] *See* 10 C.F.R. § 212.83(c) and (d).

[11] *See* 39 *Fed. Reg.* 31650 (1974).

[12] *See* 10 C.F.R. § 211.67 (1974).

> oil and the burden of dependence on uncontrolled oil among all sectors of the petroleum industry, *all regions of the country, and among all consumers of petroleum products. . . .*[13]

As TECA stated in its opinion herein, one consequence of the Entitlements Program was that if, as happened here, price-controlled crude was improperly certified as exempt (or higher priced) crude oil, the effects of the overcharges initially would be distributed among all domestic refiners; thereupon "the regulatory system was designed to insure that money spent or received by the refiners as the result of their purchases or sales of entitlements would be passed along to the ultimate consumers." [14]

B. The Proceedings Below

1. *The District Court*

On June 8, 1978, DOE instituted this enforcement action against Exxon under § 209 of the ESA, alleging that the prices Exxon had been charging since January 1975 for crude oil produced from the HFU exceeded the maximum prices permitted by law. (I R. 16). In its prayer for relief, DOE urged the District Court to order Exxon to pay the overcharges, with interest, to the United States Treasury.[15] Over the ensuing 4 years, the District Court issued 8 reported opinions and over 100 separate

---

[13] *Cities Service Co.* v. *FEA*, 529 F.2d 1016, 1021 (Em. App. 1975), *cert. denied*, 426 U.S. 947 (1976) (emphasis added).

[14] Exx. App. 87a, citing *Union Oil Co.* v. *DOE*, 688 F.2d 797, 802 (Em. App. 1982), *cert. denied*, 459 U.S. 1202 (1983). See also the decision of the District Court herein quoted at p. 7, *infra*.

[15] "Plaintiff prays that this Court enter judgment in its favor upon this Complaint: . . . 3. Ordering that Exxon make restitution of moneys, in the form of payments to the United States Treasury, equal to the amount of its overpricing for first sales of crude oil from the [Hawkins Field Unit];" (I R. 33).

orders, and TECA issued 3 reported opinions on interlocutory appeals brought by Exxon.

On August 27, 1982, DOE and Exxon filed cross-motions for summary judgment presenting both liability and remedy issues for decision. On November 24, 1982, five weeks *after* oral argument on the summary judgment, a group of 6 refiners, including 4 of the 7 petitioners in No. 85-430, and a trade association representing other refiners ("Indicated Refiners") filed a "Conditional Motion . . . To Intervene" in which they argued, as Exxon had, that "it is impossible to trace the impact of the overcharges," and that, based upon precedent in private antitrust damage actions, refiners should receive the entire overcharge fund (XLV R. 38973). Some three months *after* oral argument, 5 gasoline station operators ("Gasoline Retailers"), purporting to represent 187,000 independent branded retailers throughout the United States, filed a motion for limited intervention in the District Court; they urged that the "impact of the overcharge" should be traced through the DOE Entitlements Program to the "more than 200 refiners nationwide" and then, "taking into account each refiner's banked costs" and DOE's "[c]omprehensive compliance audits", to all "purchasers of refined products throughout the period of violation" (XLV R. 38995-38997). At Exxon's request, the District Court stayed consideration of both the Indicated Refiners' and the Gasoline Retailers' intervention motions. (ATA App. A-288 and A-289.)

On March 25, 1983, the District Court issued its Memorandum Opinion holding Exxon liable for some $895 million in crude oil overcharges between January 1975 and January 1981, plus interest. The District Court determined that, as a matter of law, Exxon was required to change its accounting practices relating to Hawkins Field crude oil on January 1, 1975, and that there was no factual dispute as to its failure to do so.

In fashioning an equitable remedy under § 209 of the ESA, the District Court determined that "the overcharges worked their way throughout the economy nationwide to the *millions of ultimate consumers of petroleum products.*" [16] Following TECA's prior holding concerning the operation of the Entitlements Program, the District Court reasoned that "[j]ust as the program spread the benefit of access to old oil, so too did the program spread the burden of Exxon's overcharges among all sectors of the petroleum industry, all regions, and all consumers [of petroleum products]." [17] The District Court also referred to record evidence of Exxon's admitted understanding of this impact [18] as well as the cost-passthrough effects of DOE's price regulations.[19] It determined:

> Exxon's overcharges were not, as it simplistically asserts, borne by Exxon itself, but instead were borne by ultimate consumers of petroleum products throughout the entire country.[20]

Accordingly, the District Court found that:

> [t]he broad scattering of the ill effects of Exxon's wrongdoing renders impossible the tracing of the overcharges to their ultimate victims and the calculation of the precise damages suffered by each.[21]

---

[16] Exx. App. 239a (emphasis added).

[17] Exx. App. at 248a, citing *Cities Service Co.* v. *FEA*, p. 5 n.13, *supra*. *See also id.* at 248a-249a, quoting *Union Oil Co.* v. *DOE*, *supra*, p. 5, n.14.

[18] Exx. App. 248a-249a.

[19] Exx. App. 249a, citing 10 C.F.R. § 212.83(c)(2)(iii) and 10 C.F.R., Part 212, Subparts F and L.

[20] Exx. App. 249a. Based on this finding, the District Court initially denied the conditional intervention motion of the Indicated Refiners and the motion for limited intervention of the Gasoline Retailers. Exx. App. 249a, n.56.

[21] Exx. App. 250a.

The District Court ordered Exxon "to make restitution of the full amount of the overcharges, plus interest, to the [United States] Treasury" [22] to be held "in trust" [23] for distribution to the States, in proportion to each State's share of nationwide consumption of petroleum products, for use in energy-related programs designed to benefit their injured citizens.[24] The procedures for disbursement to the States were modeled on the Congressional enactment of § 155 of the Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 1983.[25] The District Court explained:

> *In formulating its order, the court in no way relies on Section 155 as an express statutory grant of authority to this court, but acts instead in the exercise of its broad equitable powers to order restitution.* However, Section 155 clearly bespeaks the intent of Congress that violators of the petroleum price regulations should be made to disgorge their illgotten gains even in situations, like the case before the court, where the victims of the petroleum overcharges cannot be identified. The colossal scale of Exxon's wrongdoing, and the workings of pervasive regulations to spread the burden of that wrongdoing impossibly far and wide, must not deter this court from fashioning an appropriate equitable remedy. The purpose of the domestic petroleum price regulations was to keep oil prices down, to relieve consumers of some of the burden of towering oil costs.

---

[22] Exx. App. 254a.

[23] District Court Judgment, XXXV R. 31658 at 31659.

[24] Exx. App. 255a-256a. The programs are listed *infra* at p. 20, n.41.

[25] Pub. L. No. 97-377, 96 Stat. 1830, 1919, § 155 (1982) ("Warner Amendment" or the "Amendment"), reproduced at ATA App. A-316. In the Warner Amendment, Congress directed the Secretary of Energy to distribute up to $200 million in escrowed overcharge funds for energy related uses by the States in proportion to the relative consumption of both price-controlled and uncontrolled petroleum products in each State during the period in which price controls were in effect.

> The five energy conservation programs identified in Section 155 operate across the nation to reduce that same burden, either by reducing overall consumption through conservation or by direct financial assistance to those most in need. *Although one might speculate as to alternative remedies, this court respects the wisdom of the solution chosen by Congress and shall adopt it as the most appropriate equitable remedy in the circumstances of this case.* [Exx. App. 256a, footnote omitted, emphasis added.]

Thereafter 33 States and Territories and the District of Columbia were allowed to intervene to support the District Court's restitution order on appeal.[26] Six additional separate motions to intervene were filed by a joint total of 14 parties, including refiners, jobbers, utilities, a trucking company, a taxicab company, and an individual motorist. Each of these motions sought only to intervene for purposes of appeal. None moved the District Court to reopen the record on the question of the feasibility of tracing the effect of the overcharges or for a hearing on or reconsideration of any issue. The District Court granted all applications for intervention, including on reconsideration those of the Indicated Refiners and the Gasoline Retailers, for the purpose of arguing the remedy issue on appeal. (*See* ATA App. A-290 through A-298).

2. *The Court of Appeals*

On appeal, TECA unanimously affirmed the judgment of liability against Exxon. By a 2-1 vote, TECA also affirmed the District Court's remedy under § 209.

TECA rejected the contention "that the trial court was required to trace, or attempt to trace, the overcharges from first purchaser, to refiner, through various monthly accountings required by the Entitlements Program and its 'banking' system, and then to determine the nature

---

[26] Subsequently, 12 additional States intervened for the same purpose before TECA.

and extent of any passthrough of increased costs through the distribution system, such as might be authorized by 10 C.F.R. Section 212.83(c)-(d) (refiners) and 212.93(a) (resellers and retailers)." (Exx. App. 85a). TECA agreed with the District Court that:

> any attempt to trace the overcharges would be doomed to failure because of the pervasive influence of the Entitlements Program and other regulations which had the effect of passing on and diffusing the HFU overcharges through the distribution system. [Exx. App. 86a-87a.]

TECA explained the consequences of the Entitlements Program whereby overcharges would be passed along to the ultimate consumers (Exx. App. 87a; *see* pp. 3 to 5, *supra*) and continued:

> We agree with the trial court's conclusion that any attempt to trace increased costs attributable to the HFU overcharges would require a full scale audit of the entire petroleum industry, and that any effort to do so would be futile. As the Government suggests, the first step in any such audit would require recalculating over seventy monthly entitlement lists issued during the period of the overcharges, taking into account such variables as the volumes of new and old oil produced during each month, the average acquisition costs, and the values of each entitlement. In determining the precise impact of the overcharges on any particular refiner, it would then be necessary to consider the impact of exception relief which may have been granted by the agency over the term of the Entitlements Program.
>
> * * *
>
> Even if the HFU overcharges could be traced to individual refiners, it would then be necessary to trace their effect on product resellers, retailers and consumers, through the provisions of passthrough regulations. That this task would be futile is illustrated by the difficulty of applying only one aspect of the regulations, that is, the calculation of "banked

> costs." Exxon itself admitted that it was unable to supply information on its own costs. . . .
>
> * * *
>
> The fact that banked costs might exist as to any particular refiner does not mean of course that increased costs were not passed on through the distribution system. To determine this would require an investigation into the state of mind of each refiner in setting prices for individual petroleum products each month. Such a task would be impossible, and several of the intervenors have so conceded. [Exx. App. 88a-90a.]

TECA rejected the refiners' suggestion "that refunds be made payable to themselves as 'first purchasers' [because] that would result in inequities, inconsistent with the fundamental purpose of restitution under Section 209." (Exx. App. 90a). Moreover, TECA ruled:

> There was no need for the District Court in this action to attempt the impossible task of attempting to ascertain the damage sustained by individual consumers of petroleum products. In this respect, it should be noted that this action for restitution under Section 209 differs in significant degree from a private action of damages under Section 210 [Exx. App. 90a-91a.]

In conclusion, TECA approved the "form of relief chosen by the trial court in this action by which the restitution funds will be channeled through the states for use in the enumerated energy programs designed to benefit the consuming public . . . ." (Exx. App. 91a):

> We believe this form of disbursement to be equitable, and fair, and a reasonable method of compensating the consuming public for the HFU overcharges. It accomplishes the intent of Congress that violators of the price regulations be required to disgorge their gains, even in situations where it may not be possi-

> ble to identify and compensate each individual victim. While other remedies might have been adopted by the trial court, the remedy chosen avoids further administrative delay and confusion, with additional costs, it prevents the frustration of congressional objectives in securing prompt enforcement of what has been denominated as "emergency" price regulations, and it is a reasonable means to protect the public interest. [Exx. App. 91a-92a, footnote omitted.]

Petitions for rehearing and/or suggestions for rehearing *en banc* filed by Exxon and several intervenor appellants were denied. (Exx. App. 269a-270a). On October 23, 1985, TECA denied a motion by Marathon, Mobil and Murphy for leave to file a second petition for rehearing.

REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITIONS

The several petitions filed herein uniformly fail to demonstrate that there are, as Rule 17 requires, "special and important reasons" for this Court to grant another round of review of the District Court's exercise of its equitable discretion in formulating a restitutionary remedy for this case. The remedy chosen rests on the District Court's reasoned conclusion—based upon the regulatory scheme and the voluminous record before it—that the consequences of Exxon's overcharges were spread throughout the economy so that individual victims and amounts of injury cannot possibly be identified and that, ultimately, all oil products consumers nationwide suffered as a result of the overcharges. Accordingly, the District Court fashioned a well-grounded remedy to benefit those ultimate consumers.

In turn, TECA, "a court intimately familiar with the intricacies of federal energy regulations," (*Tully* v. *Mobil Oil Co.*, 455 U.S. 245, 248 (1982)), and empowered with exclusive appellate jurisdiction in these matters, agreed with the District Court's findings, and approved its choice

of remedy as "equitable, and fair, and a reasonable method of compensating the consuming public for the . . . overcharges". (Exx. App. 91a). In so ruling, TECA observed that "other remedies might have been adopted by the trial court" (Exx. App. 92a), and thus refrained from limiting future decisions in similar cases. Thus, far from deciding any "important question of federal law which has not been, but should be settled by this Court", it merely applied its long experience with and expertise in the regulatory mechanism it supervises to confirm that the District Court's restitutionary choice not only fell within the broad equitable discretion which prior opinions of this Court and TECA had already settled, but was a commendable exercise of that discretion in the complex context of the particular regulatory violation at issue, where identification of individual injury among many millions of potential claimants was impossible. Petitioners' attempt to narrow this discretion, and to have this Court require the trial court in every case to attempt identification of individual injury even where that task is impossible, lacks both logic and precedent.

Finally, the petitioners' various contentions that they were improperly denied procedural rights are wholly without merit. The only petitioners who sought intervention in the District Court prior to the entry of judgment did so well after final oral argument on the summary judgment motions, and their intervention papers merely added reasons for a finding of impossibility, as described above. All other petitioners requested—and were granted—intervention only for purposes of appeal. Thus, there has been no departure "from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings" requiring further review by this Court.

I. TECA'S AFFIRMANCE OF THE DISTRICT COURT'S EXERCISE OF ITS EQUITABLE DISCRETION RAISES NO ISSUE WARRANTING FURTHER REVIEW BY THIS COURT

A. Because Section 209 Of The ESA Vested The District Court With Broad Equitable Powers, The Scope Of "Appellate Review Is Correspondingly Narrow"

Section 209 of the ESA, under which the United States brought this suit against Exxon, provides that, in addition to the power to issue mandatory injunctions granted therein, "the court may also order restitution of moneys received in violation of any . . . order or regulation [under this Title]." The District Court was thus vested with broad discretionary power.[27] As Justice Harlan wrote in *Mitchell* v. *DeMario Jewelry, Inc.*, 361 U.S. 288, 291-292 (1960):

> When Congress entrusts to an equity court the enforcement of prohibitions contained in a regulatory enactment, it must be taken to have acted cognizant of the historic power of equity to provide complete relief in light of the statutory purposes.

Justice Harlan also quoted with approval and followed this Court's decision on the scope of equitable jurisdiction under § 205(a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, *Porter* v. *Warner Holding Co.*, 328 U.S. 395 (1946):

> Thus the Administrator invoked the jurisdiction of the District Court to enjoin acts and practices made illegal by the Act and to enforce compliance with the Act. Such a jurisdiction is an equitable one. Unless otherwise provided by statute, all the inherent equitable powers of the District Court are available for the proper and complete exercise of that jurisdiction. And since the public interest is involved in a pro-

---

[27] Exx. App. 86a; *Citronelle-Mobile Gathering, Inc.* v. *Edwards*, 669 F.2d 717, 721-722 (Em. App.), *cert. denied*, 459 U.S. 877 (1982); *Sauder* v. *DCE*, 648 F.2d 1341, 1348 (Em. App. 1981).

> ceeding of this nature, those equitable powers assume an even broader and more flexible character than when only a private controversy is at stake . . .
>
> Moreover, the comprehensiveness of this equitable jurisdiction is not to be denied or limited in the absence of a clear and valid legislative command. Unless a statute in so many words, or by a necessary and inescapable inference, restricts the court's jurisdiction in equity, the full scope of that jurisdiction is to be recognized and applied. "The great principles of equity, securing complete justice, should not be yielded to light inferences, or doubtful construction." *Brown* v. *Swann*, 10 Pet. 497, 503. [361 U.S. at 292, quoting 328 U.S. 397-398].

These decisions give special force herein to a corollary of the trial court's "broad discretionary power" in shaping equity decrees—that "appellate review is correspondingly narrow." *See Lemon* v. *Kurtzman*, 411 U.S. 192, 200 (1973) (Op. of Burger, C.J.). *A fortiori*, where as here, the Court of Appeals has approved as "equitable, and fair, and . . . reasonable" the District Court's exercise of its equitable jurisdiction, only a most compelling showing of abuse could justify a second round of review by this Court. No such showing has been made by any of the petitioners herein.[28]

B. The Remedy Chosen By The District Court Was Well-Grounded In Fact And Law

1. The Record And Regulatory Scheme Made It Clear That It Was Impossible To Trace The Impact Of Exxon's Overcharges To Individual Victims

The District Court found, on the basis of the record before it: "The broad scattering of the ill effects of Exxon's wrongdoing renders impossible the tracing of

---

[28] Petitioners are not identically situated substantively or procedurally. Where pertinent in this discussion, we will identify particular petitions or petitioners. Otherwise, the term "petitioners" will mean some or all of those identified in n.7, *supra*.

the overcharges to their ultimate victims and the calculation of the precise damages suffered by each." (Ex. App. 250a).[29] (See p. 7 *supra*). TECA "agree[d] with the trial court that any attempt to trace increased costs attributable to the HFU overcharges would require a full-scale audit of the entire petroleum industry, and that any effort to do so would be futile." (Exx. App. 88a). It explained that conclusion by detailed examination of the regulatory scheme, about which it has developed special expertise in the exercise of its exclusive appellate jurisdiction.

Petitioners point to no evidence which was in the record before the District Court which contradicts, let alone renders unreasonable, the District Court's and TECA's conclusion that the ultimate victims of Exxon's overcharges and the extent of their individual injuries cannot be ascertained in any manageable proceeding. Nor did any of the petitioners offer to present such evidence to the trial court in motions to intervene or otherwise. Here, however, they rely on a 1985 report by DOE's Office of Hearing and Appeals (the "OHA report") in a separate, ongoing proceeding.[30] That report, obviously,

---

[29] The tracing issue was vigorously litigated before the District Court entered judgment. As that court observed, in order "to postpone its day of reckoning" Exxon had argued:

> that it must be allowed to conduct further discovery to determine if the Entitlements Program in fact operated as it was designed and to trace the Hawkins Field overcharges to their ultimate victims. In effect, Exxon would like to launch a nationwide inquiry into the workings of more than 200 domestic refiners during a period of several years. [Exx. App. at 247a-248a.]

[30] Report of the OHA to the United States District Court for the District of Kansas in *Department of Energy Stripper Well Exemption Litigation* ("*Stripper Well Litigation*"), M.D.L. No. 378, reproduced in ATA App. at A-320. Although OHA's factfinding in the *Stripper Well Litigation* should have no bearing upon the correctness of the District Court's earlier findings in this case, based upon the record at the time judgment was entered, the States note

was not before the District Court when it rendered its decision or thereafter. In fact, the OHA report was issued on June 21, 1985, more than a year after oral argument of this case before TECA and less than two weeks before TECA issued its opinion affirming the District Court.[31] The District Court's finding cannot be overturned on the basis of a report which was not before it.[32] Nor can it be overturned on the basis of a criticism of that report,

---

that, like the District Court here, the recent report found, after nearly two years of effort, that:

> it is impossible to trace these increased costs [of crude oil to all domestic refiners] through an individual refiner's refining, distribution and marketing operations. In fact, no party sought to establish such a tracing in the context of this proceeding, or suggested a valid tracing methodology based on inspection of an individual refiner. [ATA App. A-339.]

[31] ATA's assertion that the "very facts" which it alleges concerning the possibility of tracing "appear *in the instant record* in the form of a detailed fact finding report by the OHA" (ATA Pet. 14) is, therefore, incorrect. Indeed, when the OHA report was submitted to TECA that court was careful to provide only "that the Report of OHA of June 21, 1985 be filed in the Office of the Clerk of this Court." Order Denying Without Prejudice Motion To Permit Parties To File A Supplemental Brief On The Significance Of The June 21, 1985 OHA Report And Granting Leave To File The Report. (ATA App. at A-189.)

[32] Indeed, the Kansas district court has not yet decided whether to adopt the OHA report. Moreover, in relying on that report for the proposition that it would be feasible to trace the injuries of the victims of the overcharges, petitioners fail to take due account of the two serious deficiencies which that report itself acknowledges:

First, the report rests on assumptions and estimates which it admits are subject to valid criticism. It is, in its own terms, only one theoretical estimate of the impact on the refining industry as a whole if a particular set of contested assumptions is applied.

Second, as the report states, *no methodology exists by which to determine the i[illegible] on any particular refiner, much less downstream customers [illegible] any refiner or direct purchaser.* *See* n.30, *supra*; ATA App. at A-346, A-380 to A-381.

as three refiners remarkably argue in a supplemental brief.[33]

2. *The Restitutionary Remedy Selected By The District Court Was Equitable, Fair and Reasonable*

The District Court's decision to look to the Warner Amendment (also referred to as "§ 155") as the model for its choice of restitutionary distribution to benefit consumers was a sound exercise of its discretion since "the victims of the petroleum overcharges cannot be identified." (Exx. App. 256).[34] Three points about the Amendment are especially noteworthy. First, Congress stated that where particular injured individuals "cannot be *reasonably* identified," or their injury "is too small to be capable of *reasonable* determination," a refund for energy related purposes through the States is one which is "*reasonably* expected to benefit the class of persons injured." § 155(a) (emphasis added).[35] Second, in choosing a State-

---

[33] *See* Supplemental Brief of Petitioners Marathon, Mobil, and Murphy in Support of Petitioners (No. 85-430). The materials which that brief presents concerning a controversy over various drafts of the OHA report are, of course, entirely outside the record which was before the District Court and before TECA when it affirmed. It is a measure of these petitioners' desperation that they must rely on such materials, and on the contention that OHA's supposed bias creates a due process issue under *Tumey* v. *Ohio*, 273 U.S. 510 (1927), in order to seek review of a judgment which did not in any way depend on the OHA report.

[34] Because of the change of circumstances resulting from decontrol in 1981, previous mechanisms for passing refunds along the distribution chain to ultimate consumers no longer exist. Thus, as TECA stated, refunds to first purchasers would "result in inequities, inconsistent with the fundamental purpose of restitution under § 209." (Exx. App. 90a).

[35] *See, e.g.*, 128 Cong. Rec. S15116 (daily ed. Dec. 16, 1982) (statement of Senator Percy):

> This money would come from $200 million now in escrow which has been collected from oil company overcharges to consumers during the seventies. This money rightfully belongs to the con-

based remedy, Congress necessarily found that paying such funds to the States, in proportion to their oil product consumption and on behalf of their injured citizens for energy related purposes, is "restitutional." *Id.* Third, in adopting the Amendment, Congress confirmed the propriety of DOE's repeated use of the State remedy to benefit ultimate consumers,[36] and accelerated what DOE had been intending to do with escrowed overcharge funds even without Congressional action, *i.e.*, distribute funds to States on behalf of ultimate consumers.[37]

The petitioners' primary disagreement with the District Court's remedy is, of course, that they would prefer to receive the money themselves. While they do raise objections directed specifically to the use of the Warner Amendment, these do not have any merit.

a. Petitioners argue that the District Court should not have turned to the Warner Amendment as a model be-

---

sumers who were actually overcharged during this period. But because it is impossible to identify each individual consumer, we should at least attempt to place this money where consumers in general will benefit. Distribution to the States provides the quickest means to get this money out.

[36] *See e.g., Alfred B. Alkek*, 9 DOE ¶ 82,521, at p. 85,134 (1982) ("We chose to distribute the money to state governments because we believed that they would be able to design a distribution scheme for the refund proceeds which would benefit all injured consumers in each state, and account for the varying energy-related needs of their citizens. We also believe that the states would be able to expend the proceeds in an administratively efficient and cost-effective manner."); *Adams Resources and Energy, Inc.*, 9 DOE ¶ 82,553 at p. 85,292 (1982).

[37] In proposing the Amendment, Senator Warner stated: "The Department of Energy is seeking to provide secondary remedies to State governments and is currently reviewing a distribution plan which I understand is consistent with this amendment." 128 Cong. Rec. S15115 (daily ed. Dec. 16, 1982). *See also* 128 Cong. Rec. S15701 (daily ed. Dec. 20, 1982) (statement of Senator Kennedy): "DOE has in part been proceeding in this fashion. It is the most appropriate method of providing restitution for the injuries suffered by the consumer."

cause the Amendment provided only for a one-time distribution of funds. The argument overlooks the court's clear statement that it was "in no way rel[ying] on Section 155 as an express statutory grant of authority to this court but [was acting] instead in the exercise of its broad equitable power to order restitution." (Exx. App. 256a, quoted at p. 8, *supra*).[38] Congress' decision not to *compel* future distribution on the basis of the Warner Amendment formula[39] cannot be taken as precluding a court of equity from choosing to do what Congress had done and for similar reasons.[40] "Unless otherwise provided by statute, all the inherent equitable powers of the District Court are available for the proper and complete exercise of that jurisdiction." *DeMario Jewelry*, 361 U.S. at 291, *quoting Porter*, 328 U.S. at 398; *see also Hecht Co.* v. *Bowles*, 321 U.S. 321, 330 (1944).

b. Some petitioners present undocumented assertions that they will not receive any benefit at all from the programs which the States must fund under the District Court's order.[41] While there is no requirement that the

---

[38] This fact renders frivolous the assertion of the National Freight petitioners that by selecting the approach of the Warner Amendment, the District Court violated the constitutional separation of powers. (Nat. Frt. Pet. 13-14, 21-22).

[39] The Senate-passed version made the Warner mechanism *mandatory* in all future cases. *See* 128 Cong. Rec. S15117 (daily ed., Dec. 16, 1982).

[40] Petitioners rely especially on the comments of Congressman Dingell as forbidding any use of the Warner Amendment as precedent; but, where, as shown above, the statute on its face makes clear Congress' view that its own remedy was reasonable and restitutionary, a court may accept the soundness of that judgment.

[41] The five Federal energy conservation programs involve (1) weatherization of buildings (*see* 42 U.S.C. § 6861 *et seq.*); (2) implementation of State energy conservation programs (*see* 42 U.S.C. § 6321 *et seq.*); (3) reduction of energy consumption in, or the funding of alternate energy sources for, schools and hospitals (see 42 U.S.C. § 6371 *et seq.*); (4) promotion of conservation by small businesses and individuals, (*see* 42 U.S.C. § 7001 *et seq.*); and (5)

remedy adopted by the court directly benefit each person who was injured by the overcharges, it is plain that petitioners' view of these programs is far too narrow. For example, State energy conservation plans are intended to reduce total energy consumption by all citizens and businesses within the State. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 6322(a)(1).[42] A reduction in demand can lower oil product prices, benefitting all buyers, especially commercial users, in proportion to consumption, and in long-range terms will reduce the dangers of harmful energy shortages. Moreover, the provisions which are listed in the District Court's order are sufficiently broad and flexible to permit funding of programs which would quite specifically benefit businesses such as those represented by various petitioners. Without attempting to be exhaustive, we note in the margin some possibilities which readily come to mind.[43]

---

assistance to low-income people in paying home utility bills (*see* 42 U.S.C. § 8621, *et seq.*). *See* Exx. App. 255a, n.58.

[42] To achieve that goal, the plans are *required* to promote more efficient lighting for public buildings and thermal efficiency standards and insulation requirements for new and renovated buildings. 42 U.S.C. § 6322(c). The States are further permitted to adopt transportation controls, programs of public education, and "any other appropriate method or programs to conserve and to improve efficiency in the use of energy." 42 U.S.C. § 6322(d)(5).

[43] State energy conservation plans are intended to be coordinated with the operation of State energy extension service plans, 42 U.S.C. § 7005(h), which in turn allow the States to provide on-site energy use evaluations and recommendations to consumers and businesses, including information about the availability of aid for "planning, financing, installation, and effective monitoring of energy-related facilities and activities." 42 U.S.C. § 7004(b)(6) and (b)(7). Airports and airlines could seek aid for airport improvements to reduce fuel burning caused by delays in landing time under these provisions. Part 450 of 10 C.F.R. contains a list of energy conservation measures already approved by DOE for implementation by State energy extension services with both residential and industrial applications, including, for example, audits, insulation measures, control systems and installation of high efficiency

In short, it was fully appropriate for the District Court to look "at the policy of the legislation and fashion[] a remedy that will effectuate that policy," *Textile Workers* v. *Lincoln Mills*, 353 U.S. 448, 457 (1957), and in doing so, (as the District Court said) to "respect[] the wisdom of the solution chosen by Congress and [to] adopt it as the most appropriate equitable remedy in the circumstances of this case." (Exx. App. at 256a).

3. *TECA's Decision is Entirely Consistent With This Court's Decisions*

TECA in this case and in its prior decisions has fully attended to this Court's major teaching in *Porter* v. *Warner Holding Co.*, *supra*, that in these public enforcement cases, courts should exercise broad and flexible powers to do equity.[44] Nevertheless, citing private damage action precedents, and ignoring *Porter's* distinction between such private actions and public restitution actions,[45] petitioners argue that *Porter* restricted the scope of equitable jurisdiction, and required individual injury determinations in every overcharge restitution case. They do so by tearing out of context the concluding paragraph of the *Porter* opinion, from which they quote.[46] That paragraph

---

equipment. These are precisely the type of efforts in which many utilities already engage and which the States could help finance under the remedy adopted by the District Court.

[44] *See Citronelle-Mobile* and *Sauder*, p. 14, n.27, *supra*.

[45] "Restitution, which lies within that equitable jurisdiction [granted by § 205(a) of the 1942 price control Act] is consistent with and differs greatly from the damages and penalties which may be awarded under § 205(e)." 328 U.S. at 402.

[46] Marathon's argument that by "restitution, Congress meant the refund of overcharges to the party injured" as in *United States* v. *Lieb*, 333 F. Supp. 424 (W.D. Tex. 1971), *aff'd*, 462 F.2d 1161 (Em. App. 1972) (Mar. Pet. 15), is wholly without merit. Where Congress takes pain to confirm an expressly "inherent equitable power" of historically large scope, its action is not to be construed as nar-

set forth the trial court's authority and responsibility on remand to resolve "conflicting claims and counterclaims between tenants and landlord as to the amounts due . . ." (328 U.S. at 403). The "interested parties" whom the trial court was instructed to bring in, if necessary, were the tenants against whom the landlord had such counterclaims, a small and readily ascertainable class.[47] The purpose of bringing them in was not to allow them to assert claims for restitution (which the Secretary was doing on their behalf) but to enable the court to adjudicate any "counterclaims" against them by the landlord.

Because "[t]he broad scattering of the ill effects of Exxon's wrongdoing renders impossible the tracing of the overcharges to their ultimate victims and the calculation of the precise damages suffered by each," [48] the teachings of *Porter* which are truly applicable in this case are those which forcefully affirm the broad powers of the courts of equity to fashion a restitutionary remedy, *see* pp. 14 to 15, *supra*. Petitioners' insistence that proceedings were required which would enable them, and the literally countless other persons and entities who were similarly

---

rowing the courts' discretion by requiring them to conform to the particular circumstance of a case which is cited in the legislative history to illustrate that the power already exists.

[47] This portion of the *Porter* opinion was a response to the landlord's argument, based on evidence that he "may have valid counterclaims against certain tenants for damage to or theft of its property." (Br. for Warner Holding Co., No. 793, Oct. T. 1945, p. 36, quoting 60 F. Supp. 513, 520.) This Court's opinion answered the trial court's question: "Could this court, without a jury, adjudicate the amount of restitution in each of the twenty rental units involved here, some of which have had several different tenants, without the tenants before it and without the defendant having an opportunity to interpose valid counterclaims as a defense?" (*Id.*) This Court held that a court of equity did have the power to adjudicate the counterclaims and to bring the tenants before it for that purpose.

[48] Exx. App. at 250a.

situated, to prove their individual injuries in order that they may be compensated, cannot be reconciled with those teachings. Indeed, as the District Court recognized, adoption of the petitioners' position would, as a practical matter, nullify the restitutionary remedy "because DOE [or a court] could never accurately determine the losses suffered by any one claimant." (Exx. App. at 253a.)

The decision below is also entirely consistent with *Federal Power Commission* v. *Interstate Natural Gas Co.*, 336 U.S. 577 (1949). While *Interstate* directed the federal court to make a "prognostication" as to what would in fact have happened as a consequence of federal or State law if the stay had not been issued (*id.* at 584), it was evidently anticipated that this task could readily be accomplished:

> Distribution of the fund should not involve prolonged litigation. It is an administrative matter involving the exercise of an informed judgment by the federal court and should have the flexibility and dispatch which characterize the administrative process. [*Id.*]

Here, by contrast, the courts below have found that allocating the fund among the potential individual claimants is "impossible." (Exx. App. 86a-91a, 247a-151a).[49]

Surprisingly, since this Court does not sit to resolve intracircuit conflicts, petitioners attempt to make much of a supposed inconsistency between the decision below

---

[49] Some petitioners place particular reliance on a portion of Justice Frankfurter's separate concurring opinion. In so doing, they omit the concluding sentence of the paragraph from which they quote: "It will be time enough to distribute the fund by some makeshift rule of thumb if what is concededly a rule of intrinsic fairness should be found judicially unenforceable." (336 U.S. at 590). Justice Frankfurter recognized that even a "makeshift rule of thumb" would be preferable to imposing upon the lower court a duty which it could not perform; here, no "makeshift" rule was needed since there existed a model well grounded in Congressional and administrative example.

and that in *Citronelle-Mobile Gathering, supra.* In so doing, petitioners simply disregard TECA's careful and detailed explanation (Exx. App. 85a-87a) of why "the District Court's judgment and Order . . . are fully in accord with our ruling in *Citronelle* . . . ." (*Id.* 85a).

II. NONE OF THE PETITIONS PRESENTS A PROCEDURAL ISSUE WARRANTING REVIEW

Petitioners present an array of procedural objections to the District Court's decision, invoking variously Rules 24 (intervention) and 56 (summary judgment) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. Their common objection, whatever the form of their individual arguments, is that the District Court should have granted them a hearing on the issue of remedy. A close examination of the proceedings below and of the respective petitions shows that none of the petitioners present a procedural issue meriting review.

A. At the outset, it is essential to recall that most of the parties that are now petitioners here sought leave from the court to intervene *only for the purposes of appeal.* This was true of all the parties who moved to intervene after the court issued its decision—specifically three of the refiners who petition in No. 85-430 (Marathon, Mobil and Murphy); all parties to the ATA petition (No. 84-432) except the Gasoline Retailers (specifically ATA, Petroleum Marketers and Jobbers); as well as PECO (No. 85-440); and all parties to the National Freight petition (No. 85-444) (National Freight, RJG Cab and Sweeney). These parties did not move the District Court for leave to adduce any evidence to refute any of the findings which the court had made or otherwise to reconsider its decision. In short, since the District Court granted the postjudgment movants all the intervention which they sought, they cannot now assert that the court denied them any procedural rights.

B. This leaves to be considered only the procedural objections of the prejudgment (but post-oral argument) movants, the Indicated Refiners and the Gasoline Retailers.

1. Four of the refiners who were parties to the Indicated Refiners' prejudgment motion to intervene have joined in the Marathon petition;[50] that petition raises two related procedural issues. (Mar. Pet. i).

The first is that the District Court should have given notice and an opportunity to be heard to all potential claimants. That issue is insubstantial. The court could not possibly provide notice or an opportunity to be heard to all such persons, which include not only the present intervenors, but all others similarly situated, including, for example, 187,000 gasoline retailers and tens of millions of individual motorists. The refiners have asserted that *they* were injured and were unable to pass through all of the overcharges, but not that other persons such as consumers bore none of the burden. Moreover, as the refiners recognize, TECA ruled that such notice was unnecessary "on the theory that actual overcharges are incapable of judicial proof." (Mar. Pet. 20). They now contend—and this is the second part of the question which they present—that "that 'finding' is pure speculation." (*Id.*).

As shown above, however, the District Court's finding was fully substantiated in the Court's analysis of the regulatory framework and the particular record before it, the issue having been pressed by Exxon. Even more important for present purposes, the refiners cannot ask this Court to review that finding because, far from proffering any contrary evidence, they conceded the impossibility of tracing the overcharges below. In the District Court the Indicated Refiners asserted that "it is impossible to trace the impact of the overcharges directly to

---

[50] They are Ashland, Pennzoil, Tenneco and Tosco.

any subsequent purchasers." (XLV R. 38973). Before TECA, the other refiners who here join in the Marathon petition asserted that with respect to both controlled and uncontrolled petroleum products that it would be impossible to determine whether or not the refiners absorbed or passed on the overcharges.[51]

The refiners so argued because their position in the courts below was that the rule in antitrust damage suits under *Hanover Shoe, Inc.* v. *United Shoe Machinery Corp.*, 392 U.S. 481 (1968) and *Illinois Brick Co.* v. *Illinois*, 431 U.S. 720 (1977) should be applied by analogy. They argued that in providing a remedy under § 209, the District Court was bound to award restitution to the first purchaser without regard to actual injury, as TECA had done in certain circumstances in private § 210 damage suits. TECA rejected that restrictive view of § 209 (Exx. App. 90a) and the question presented in the Marathon petition does not challenge this basis for denying the refiners' claim. That is, of course, a separate and independent ground for denying the refiners' petition.[52]

2. The Gasoline Retailers present no question or argument relating to the fact that their motion to intervene

---

[51] Brief of Intervenor-Appellants Marathon Petroleum Company, *et al.*, at 16-17. This statement by Marathon, *et al.* and that of another refiner which is not a petitioner here were cited by TECA in making the very ruling which the refiners now challenge. *See* Exx. App. 90a, quoted at p. 11, *supra*.

[52] In the closing footnote of their petition, the refiners say that, if the lower courts had applied the principles of the above-cited decisions, "*the impossibility of proving the absorption or pass on of overcharges in transactions subsequent to the first purchases* would have required the entire restitutionary award to be made to the first purchaser unless a showing was made that a subsequent purchaser had a fixed quantity cost plus contract or its functional equivalent." (Mar. Pet. 24, n.21, emphasis added). The underscored passage is consistent with the refiners' position below, but cannot be reconciled with the theory of their petition—that they are entitled to a hearing on whether it is "impossible".

was filed prior to the District Court's judgment.[53] Rather, their petition makes a more general point, applicable to all the parties which join therein, that, because the District Court had granted them intervention as a matter or right under Rule 24(a), it violated that Rule by denying them the opportunity to present evidence of their injury. ATA Pet. i, first question; 18-21.[54] This contention is a *non sequitur*, for Rule 24(a) contains within it the requirement that the motion to intervene as of right be "timely".

Here, all the motions which sought intervention for the *purpose of appeal* were timely for that purpose and were granted. On the other hand, neither the motion of the Gasoline Retailers nor that of the Indicated Refiners, which were filed prior to judgment but after oral argument on DOE and Exxon's motions for summary judgment, were timely for the purpose of requiring the District Court to reopen its proceedings. The indisputable fact is that from the very outset of this case it has been clear that the United States was seeking restitution in the form of a payment into the United States Treasury. (*See* Complaint quoted at p. 5, n. 15, *supra*). The movants did not suggest in the District Court—nor do they

---

[53] The Retailers' motion to intervene was originally denied by the District Court on the basis of its finding that the real victims of the overcharges were the ultimate *consumers* of petroleum products. (Exx. App. 249a, n.56). It is significant that the petition for certiorari in which they joined contains nothing to show that any retailer can demonstrate injury as a result of Exxon's overcharges.

[54] The parties to the ATA petition other than the Gasoline Retailers cannot maintain that contention for the additional reason that they moved to intervene only for the purposes of appeal. They are thus making the unsupportable assertion that the District Court erred by denying them that for which they did not ask. Likewise, since *none* of the petitioners opposed the granting of summary judgment, in accordance with the procedures of Rule 56 or otherwise, the argument in the ATA petition, pp. 21-23, that their rights under Rule 56 were infringed is also untenable.

demonstrate now—that they had a right to wait until the proceedings before the District Court were virtually complete before seeking to make a record on their claims.

The position urged in the ATA petition would lead to the absurd result that, where intervention is as of right, intervention may not be granted for purposes of appeal only. This Court has, however, approved intervention for purposes of appeal only, stressing that the propriety of such an appeal depends on "whether in view of all the circumstances the intervenor acted promptly after the entry of final judgment." *United Airlines, Inc.* v. *McDonald*, 432 U.S. 385, 395-396 (1977). *Cf. NAACP* v. *New York*, 413 U.S. 345, 366 (1973). In *McDonald*, intervention had been allowed under Rule 24(b), *see id.* at 390, but the Court there cited with approval a series of court of appeals decisions which allowed intervention for purposes of appeal only under Rule 24(a). (*Id.* at 395-396, n.16).[55]

No distinction between Rules 24(a) and (b) for this purpose has been proffered in the ATA petition, or readily suggests itself. If petitioners' submission were correct, a party whose interest is sufficient to allow intervention as of right and is timely for purpose of appeal could not be granted such intervention without being allowed to reopen the case in the trial court, even if its intervention is untimely for that purpose. Any such result would either defeat the right to intervene for purposes of appeal only or undermine the timeliness requirement of Rule 24(a).

---

[55] These cases are: *Hodgson* v. *United Mine Workers*, 153 U.S. App. D.C. 407, 419, 473 F.2d 118, 129 (1972); *Smuck* v. *Hobson*, 132 U.S. App. D.C. 372, 378-379, 408 F.2d 175, 181-182 (1969); *Pellegrino* v. *Nesbit*, 203 F.2d 463, 465-466 (9th Cir. 1953); *Wolpe* v. *Poretsky*, 70 U.S. App. D.C. 141, 144, 144 F.2d 505, 508, *cert. denied*, 323 U.S. 777 (1944). The reports of the other cited cases do not state whether Rule 24(a) or (b) intervention was involved.

In sum, the prejudgment movants' procedural objections are no more worthy of review than those of the other petitioners, who intervened for purposes of appeal only.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the petitions for certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

FRANCIS X. BELLOTTI
Attorney General
of Massachusetts
GEORGE B. DEAN
ALAN L. KOVACS
One Ashburton Place—
20th Floor
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

DAVID FROHNMAYER
Attorney General of Oregon
DONALD C. ARNOLD
100 State Office Building
Salem, Oregon 43710

JOHN VAN DE KAMP
Attorney General of California
YEORYIOS C. APALLAS
6000 State Building
350 McAllister
San Francisco, California 94102

ANDREW P. MILLER
GEORGE KAUFMANN
STEPHAN G. WIELGOZ
DICKSTEIN, SHAPIRO & MORIN
2101 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 785-9700

BERNARD NASH
EDWARD G. MODELL
BLUM, NASH & RAILSBACK
1133 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 857-0220

JAMES F. FLUG
PAULA DINERSTEIN
LOBEL, NOVINS & LAMONT
1275 K Street, N.W.
Suite 770
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 371-6626

December 23, 1985